

amendment and the amendment of August 24, 1995 be entered and this application be allowed.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. '358, alone or in view of Yamazaki et al. '855 and Toshiba KK or NEC Corp. '131 or '123 or Traskos et al. or Hongo et al. or Krimmel et al. Previously, Applicants claimed priority based on Japanese priority application 61-229252 in order to remove Yamazaki et al. '358 as prior art. The Examiner subsequently requested a showing that all information in presently pending claims 1-16 is supported by application 61-229252. Applicants' "Amendment After Final" filed August 24, 1995 attempted to show support for the claimed subject matter. However, in the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicates that the indicated portions of the priority application "have nothing to do with redirecting the beam path which is what Applicants have claimed." Applicant's representative telephoned the Examiner on October 19, 1995 seeking clarification of the Examiner's comments. As a result, it was determined that the Examiner feels that the claim language directed to expanding and condensing the beam in a respective "direction" is unclear.

By this amendment, claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to clarify that the expanding and condensing of the laser beam in respective directions results in a respective increase and decrease of respective first and second cross-sectional dimensions. Applicants' believe these amendments provide sufficient clarity and definiteness to the claim language as supported by the present specification and Japanese priority application No. 61-229252. The '252 priority application discloses in Figs. 2A-2D and discusses on Page 6, lines 1-17 each of the emitting, expanding, masking and condensing steps. Moreover, the "direction" language

is believed to be clear and unambiguous in light of the specification and the amendments to the claims which clearly and accurately teach increasing and decreasing respective cross-sectional dimensions of the beam by expanding and condensing the beam in respective directions.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Yamazaki et al. '358 be removed as a prior art reference to the present application. With Yamazaki et al. '358 removed as a prior art reference, it is believed that the present rejections to claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are rendered moot and, therefore, have been overcome. Moreover, it is believed that the numerous other prior art references presently of record do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in amended claims 1, 11, and 16. Therefore, it is believed that independent claims 1, 11 and 16 are allowable and that dependent claims 2-10 and 12-15 are likewise allowable in that they depend from allowable base claims 1, 11, and 16. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections under §103 is in order and respectfully requested.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that no new issues have been raised after final rejection and that no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims. The expansion and condensing of the beam was present in the original claims of the present application, discussed in the specification and illustrated in the drawings in cross-sectional views of the beam. The present amendments are merely being made to clarify the original language.

In view of the foregoing and Applicants' "Amendment After Final" filed August 24, 1995, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner deems that any issue remains after

Application Serial No. 08/169,127
Attorney's Docket No. 0756-945

considering this response, she is invited to call the undersigned to expedite the prosecution and work out any such issue by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

SIXBEY, FRIEDMAN, LEEDOM
& FERGUSON, P.C.

By: 
Tim L. Brackett, Jr.
Registration No. 36,092

2010 Corporate Ridge
Suite 600
McLean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: (703) 790-9110

Dated: November 6, 1995